DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 156 733 UD 018 177

AUTHOR Kaufman, Maurice; And Others
TITLE An Evaluation of Project LEAP, E.S.E.A. Title I Program of Medford, Massachusetts, 1976-1977.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 87p.; For related documents, see UD 018 176 and UD 018 452; Pages 84-89, copyrighted material, have been deleted

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Achievement Gains; Comparative Statistics; *Compensatory Education Programs; *Elementary Education; Language Arts; Parent Participation; Physical Education; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Reading Improvement; Speech Therapy; *Student Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; Massachusetts (Medford)

ABSTRACT

An Elementary and Secondary Education Title I program for the 1976-77 school year was conducted in public and parochial schools in Medford, Massachusetts. The program provided reading and language arts instruction, physical education, speech therapy, and counseling. Children in grades K-6 who scored below the fortieth percentile on school department achievement tests were eligible. The evaluators conducted on site observations and staff interviews. Data obtained on achievement tests, questionnaires, and checklists were analyzed. First graders were found to have made significant gains in word knowledge and word analysis, while second graders made gains in tests of word knowledge, word analysis, reading and spelling. Third through sixth graders made significant gains in tests of word knowledge, reading, language and spelling. Kindergarten children progressed in knowledge of letters and sounds and in aural comprehension. In addition, children selected for physical education improved in psychomotor development. There were consistent indications of growth in children's self confidence, responsibility, cooperation and interest. Parents found the program effective and helpful. (Author/GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED156733

AN EVALUATION OF PROJECT LEAP,
E.S.E.A. TITLE I PROGRAM OF
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS
1976-1977

MAURICE KAUFMAN

ALBERT KOVNER

LESLIE BURG

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Maurice Kaufman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY

BOSTON

1977

UD018177

EVALUATION OF PROJECT LEAP, 1976-1977

ABSTRACT

The ESEA Title I program for the 1976-1977 school year conducted by the Public Schools of Medford, Massachusetts was held in thirteen public and parochial schools for children in grades k-6. The program provided reading and language arts instruction, physical education, speech therapy, and counseling. Children who scored below the fortieth percentile on school department achievement testing were eligible. The evaluators conducted on-site observations and staff interviews. Data obtained on achievement tests, questionnaires, and checklists were analyzed. First-graders made significant gains in word knowledge and word analysis. Second-graders made significant gains in tests of word knowledge, word analysis, reading, and spelling. Third through sixth-graders made significant gains in tests of word knowledge, reading, language, and spelling. Kindergarten children progressed in knowledge of letters and sounds and in aural comprehension. Children selected for physical education improved in psychomotor development. There were consistent indications of growth in children's self-confidence, responsibility, cooperation, and interest. Parents found the program effective and helpful.

CONTENTS

Description of the Program..... 1

Evaluation of the Program in Progress..... 5

Administration of the Program..... 13

Test Results and Analysis

- Metropolitan Achievement Test..... 16
- Stanford Early School Achievement Test..... 25
- Phonics..... 27
- Structural Analysis..... 30
- Physical Education..... 32
- Behavior Attitude Checklist..... 36
- Results of Parent Questionnaire..... 48
- Parent Advisory Council Comments..... 56

Conclusions and Recommendations..... 60

Appendix

- Self Evaluation Checklist..... i
- Report of Specialists
  - Remedial Reading..... v
  - Speech and Language..... ix
  - Physical Education..... xiii
  - School Adjustment Counselor..... xvi
- LEAP dissemination activities

Description of the Program

General

The Language Education Acceleration Program, LEAP, which Medford offers students under the aegis of Title I, E.S.E.A., is clearly described by the Director:

The basic goal of this program is to strengthen the Communication Skills, and the emotional and academic foundations on which such skills are based, of a specified number of children falling considerably below established norms in such skills, who currently reside in the identified target school attendance areas.

The vehicle to realize this goal will be a coordinated and concentrated multi-disciplinary team of Communication Specialists and teachers, federally funded, working in conjunction with and supplementing specialists now at work in the school department.

Our premise is that every child has a right to the full development and natural evolvement of his latent communication abilities regardless of socio-economic, emotional, receptive or expressive, graphic or verbal disabilities.

The Director, together with the Evaluators, Title I specialists and teachers, will identify the priority communications needs of children in the groups.

Specific needs in speech and reading will be met by

specialists in those fields, In addition, Title I teachers will supplement instruction and be supportive of identified children both in the classroom and in small groups and tutorial relationships.

The foregoing Instructional Staff will have as its main responsibility the development of skills in the Cognitive and Affective Domains.

Since communication deficiencies sometimes have roots in social or emotional problems, the program will include a school adjustment counselor who will be available to supplement the work of the regularly assigned school adjustment counselor and the school psychologist. The attention of these existing and Title I services will be focused on Psychological, Social, and Interpersonal Relationship Skills Development.

The Physical Development of the children will be monitored by existing health services of the school department.

Motor Development will be among the responsibilities of the appropriate physical education specialists as prescribed by the school department. The Title I staff will include a Developmental Physical Education Specialist to supplement the work of the school department physical education program.

The list of concerns is long. They form the basis and foundation of the program. The keystone, however, is their effective coordination with existing instructional and related services and their focused concentration on priority

needs. This will be accomplished through frequent consultation and cooperation with the Administrator's Advisory Council and the Parent Advisory Council.

TITLE I - LEAP OBJECTIVES

COGNITIVE

1. To reduce significantly the numbers of children scoring below grade in language skills on regularly administered standardized tests.

2. To increase substantially the numbers of children meeting grade level norms in paragraph meaning sections of regularly administered standardized tests.

3. To provide supplementary coordinated and concentrated remedial services to qualified and identified children.

4. To focus the attention of all school department services, existing and Title I, on the priority needs of educationally deprived children to strengthen all aspects of their language acquisition skill in order to realize their highest potential for effective communication.

AFFECTIVE DOMAIN

Within the affective domain, activities of the program are directed so that:

1. The child will choose to share with the class, through bulletin boards, show and tell, etc., a project he

has completed.

2. The child will use effective communication in peer relationships.

3. The child will listen carefully to direction.

4. The child will carry out instructions to the best of his ability, including oral and graphic instructions commensurate with his maturity.

5. The child will treat other children as he wishes to be treated, acknowledging communication is multi-directional.

6. The child will accept constructive criticism by trying to correct his mistake, rather than by denying the mistake.

7. The child, will through oral communication skills, share his ideas with the class voluntarily.

8. The child will consider his actions and the results of those actions as an aid in making decisions.

9. The child will act in accordance with rules made by the class.

10. The child will give others a chance to speak without interrupting, respecting their right to communicate.

Evaluation of the Program in Progress

The evaluators visited the program several times each month. Meetings were held with the LEAP staff, the P.A.C., and two evaluators (Burg and Kaufman) presented workshops on various aspects of comprehension in the teaching of reading. This section is based on on-site observations and additional information collected by the program Director.

Program facilities for instructional purposes again ranged from good to excellent. Most of the participating schools had allocated a special room to the program in past years and these have been maintained as such or improved. Notable improvement was evident at the Osgood School where the large basement room used last year was attractively renovated and carpeted to provide better acoustical quality. The Hervey School, which introduced the program last year, got off to a smooth start in September. Facilities there were adequate, and used library books were made available to the program by the school. The principal has been most cooperative, the LEAP instructor very competent, and in general the Hervey School program has evolved into an effective, efficient operation.

LEAP program materials continue to be excellent in quantity, quality and variety. Both hardware and software were available and the central resource center provided easy accessibility so that maximum utilization of materials was

encouraged. As in the past, teachers employed these materials creatively and appropriately. It appeared that more work was done with audio-visual media this year with continued assistance from a Title I instructor whose graduate study was in this area. In addition, teachers continued to develop their own materials and encouraged the children to prepare filmstrips, tapes, photographs, etc. so that individual needs were accommodated and youngsters were active participants in the learning process. Importantly, parents seemed to make greater use of Title I materials this year. This may be the result of increased parental interest and involvement fostered by the staff, and of workshops designed specifically for parents and conducted by staff specialists.

Title I instructors continue to provide a very high quality program. There was a strong emphasis on diagnosis and diagnostic teaching. Standardized tests and evaluator-constructed instruments were used along with the checklists of behavior objectives and the Behavior/Attitude Checklist developed by the staff. Informal assessments were made as necessary and evaluation of childrens' progress was continuous. As previously done, test information was recorded on individual pupil profile charts so that it was available to classroom teachers and specialists as well as to instructors. This method of record keeping greatly facilitates communication among staff professionals about childrens' needs, program, and progress. A few children were referred to 766 this year and

Title I staff members participated in the core evaluations for these youngsters. If it was appropriate, these students continued to receive LEAP instruction.

The use of experientially-based teaching was in greater evidence this year than ever before. This approach, which capitalizes on the students' language experiential background and interests, is to be generally recommended, but it is particularly desirable when working with disabled readers. The staff is to be commended for making this approach a philosophical cornerstone of their program.

The use of "Specialties," which encourages each child to become an expert in an area of interest, was continued this year with seeming success. This technique allows for individualization of skills and interests and promotes a positive self-concept as well. It incorporates easily and effectively into an experiential program of instruction.

Last year, instructors at the Oxgood School worked with several non-English speaking children. The possibility of an increase in this population was discussed in the 1975-1976 evaluation report. However, no increase has occurred and these children have been effectively integrated into the existing program group as their needs dictated. Still, the numbers of this population should be monitored so that provision for appropriate inservice instruction for staff members can be made if it becomes necessary.

In addition to instructors, the program employed two Reading Specialists, two Speech and Language Pathologists, a Physical Education specialist, a School Adjustment Counselor, and a Consulting Psychologist. These specialists have continued to work well and productively with children, LEAP staff, classroom teachers, and parents.

There has been increased emphasis on leadership roles for specialists as recommended by the evaluators over the past two years. This year specialists conducted inservice workshops not only for LEAP instructors, but for parents as well. Staff workshops were conducted by the Speech and Language Pathologists, the School Adjustment Counselor, and the Consulting Psychologist. The Speech and Language Pathologists also sponsored a workshop by Mr. Robert S. Anderson, Supervisor of Audiology at the Tufts New England Medical Center. He spoke on the identification, remediation, and rehabilitation of hearing problems.

Parent workshops were conducted by the Reading Specialists, the Speech and Language Pathologists ("Speech and Language Development"), and the School Adjustment Counselor. The evaluators are pleased to note that the Title I specialists are fulfilling their roles in a highly commendable manner at present. The offering of structured workshops for parents is a most important and praiseworthy addition to the program. (See Specialists' reports in the Appendix.)

Through the continued efforts of the program Director, Mrs. Elizabeth Miles, inservice staff development has remained

a strong and vital element in the program. Inservice instruction was accomplished through weekly staff meetings; inservice workshops for staff by staff specialists, and specialists external to the LEAP program; visits to other exemplary Title I programs in Massachusetts and attendance at state and regional conferences including meetings of speech and hearing associations, reading and learning disabilities, counseling, Boston University's "Expo '77," the State Fiscal Management Conference, and a seminar at St. Elizabeth's Hospital on emergency treatment of athletic injuries. Members who made visits or attended conferences or workshops shared relevant information obtained at these sessions with the LEAP staff.

The LEAP staff was selected to present its program to the members of the Title I program in Randolph, Massachusetts. LEAP was also chosen as the language arts program for demonstration at the State Title I Conference in Hyannis, Massachusetts, where a slide presentation of the essential components of LEAP was made by the program Director, Mrs. Miles, and members of the staff. In addition, Mrs. Miles served as a team leader for the State program review committee of the Boston Title I program.

As part of its staff development work this year, the LEAP staff, under the direction of Mrs. Miles, developed a Self Evaluation Checklist so that it might better be able to monitor and assess its own teaching performance. This

undertaking, with its emphasis on continuous renewal and upgrading is most laudatory. A copy of the checklist may be found in the Appendix to this report.

There was continued emphasis this year on parent involvement, and through the efforts of the P.A.C. and the program Director, Mrs. Miles, meaningful parent participation was strengthened. In addition to the types of activities they participated in last year (i.e. sponsoring of kindergarten teas at Title I schools to inform other parents about the program, assisting in kindergarten registration, etc.) they began to assume an increased leadership role. Mrs. Roseleen Dello Russo of P.A.C. and Mrs. Miles attended the National Conference for the National Coalition of Title I Parents in New Orleans; Mrs. Francis Amari, P.A.C. Chairperson, was elected to the State Title I P.A.C. A slide presentation on Medford's P.A.C. projects was given for the Boston Regional P.A.C. workshop and Medford sponsored a regional P.A.C. meeting to share ideas with members of other P.A.C.s. P.A.C. members have attended School Committee meetings, and P.A.C.'s executive board presented their views on the qualities they considered important in the new Superintendent of Public Schools in Medford. The School Committee on May 2 issued a commendation to Medford's P.A.C. "for their dedication and fine work in connection with this program."

The P.A.C. produced a display for the citywide Ethnic-Folk Fair where they disseminated information about the

program and distributed the LEAP Title I Parents' Handbook. Preparation of the Handbook was also a project of the parents. Other activities included: encouragement of recreational reading through book sharing time at Title I schools, gifts of bookmarks to all children in LEAP, and preparation and distribution of lists for summer reading.

In addition the P.A.C. met with the program evaluators to discuss the results of last year's program and collated the information from the survey of parent attitudes in the present evaluation.

In general, the work of the P.A.C. this year contributed significantly to the program. Strong and continuing parent involvement is greatly desirable as it produces, over time, an educated populace which can more knowledgeably support and educate its children.

The community was kept well informed about LEAP. In addition to the displays, exhibits, and workshops presented by staff members and parents at meetings and conferences; teas and open house activities were instrumental in disseminating information about the program. Local newspapers covered highlights of the program as well, publishing four articles concerned with LEAP activities during the year.

The work of the program Director-Supervisor, Mrs. Elizabeth Miles, deserved special commendation. Her efforts in the areas of staff development and parent involvement, in particular, have significantly improved the effectiveness of these program components. In the opinion of the evaluators,

her commitment to making project LEAP an exemplary Title I program is both praiseworthy and successful.

LEAP is well supported by its administrative office staff as well. As noted earlier, record keeping is meticulous and each student's record is carefully maintained and current. The central school department administration and school principals have been supportive and cooperative also. The review of all pertinent aspects of the program leads us to conclude that Medford's project LEAP continues to be of exceptionally high caliber, serving its children, and the broader community extremely well.

Administration of the Program

While most of this evaluation report deals with student growth and development, an important aspect of the success or failure of such a program lies in its organization and administration. In particular, two aspects of the program warrant further examination as a reflection of LEAP progress: staff development and community involvement.

The LEAP staff actively engages in service activities, organized by the director which includes the use of outside consultants, LEAP specialists and other members of the Medford staff. These activities cover a wide range of topics: an example of use of specialists is the meeting conducted by the Title I Adjustment Counselor dealing with "Understanding Anxiety in Children." At the other end are the informal meetings during which LEAP staff members review available materials and participate in decisions relative to purchase and use.

In addition a rapport which has developed over time makes it possible for the Title I Director and the teachers to engage in a number of staff improvement projects. While teachers are visited and observed on a regular basis, they are also free to contact the Director for a particular observation or conference and also have access to other specialists. The general level of instruction seems to reflect these efforts at improvement and, coordinated with

the more formal evaluation reports has steadily improved over the years.

The second aspect, community involvement, begins with the Title I requirement that a Parent Advisory Council be formed. The LEAP building and town-wide P.A.C.s however, seem to be particularly active and have been very involved in the program. (See results of Parent Questionnaire) An example or two will indicate the range of this involvement: The P.A.C. members visit Title I classes and encourage children to read to them and to talk about their books. One P.A.C. member helped the teacher and children to develop a Learning Center Library. P.A.C. has also encouraged parents to borrow materials from the Learning Center to help children at home. Such borrowing is preceded by an "advice session" with the teacher or the Director as to the use of the material to supplement student classroom learning. P.A.C. members also participate in the development of each year's LEAP budget and have been involved in state and regional P.A.C. matters, by making presentations and assuming leadership posts.

Mention might be made of other administrative activities: The careful compilation and transferral of student records; close communication with administrators through the Administrator's Advisory Committee; the gradual improvement of LEAP physical facilities. These and similar matters are manifestation of the overall guidance which

the program receives from the Medford School Department and the Title I Director and office staff, which combine to facilitate the growth and effectiveness of LEAP.

Metropolitan Achievement Test Results

The principle instrument for measuring pupil achievement was the Metropolitan Achievement Test. The following levels and forms were administered both as pretests and as post-tests (in October 1976 and May 1977 respectively):

Grade 1: Primary I Form F

Grade 2: Primary II Form F

Grade 3: Elementary Form F

Grade 4: Elementary Form F

Grade 5: Intermediate Form F

Grade 6: Intermediate Form F

Except for three children tested on lower levels of the test for diagnostic purposes, all children received the level of the test assigned to their grade level. The number of children who completed both pre- and post-tests is:

Grade 1	119
Grade 2	73
Grade 3	62
Grade 4	82
Grade 5	71
Grade 6	103

Results were reported in standard score units. Standard scores on the Metropolitan tests are determined by the raw score. A particular raw score on one subtest at one level

converts to one standard score regardless of the time of year the test is administered. Therefore a comparison of pretest and posttest standard scores can be interpreted as indicating improvement in ability: a student who obtains a higher standard score on the posttest got more items correct on the posttest than on the pretest.

Tables 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 show the pretest and post-test results on the Metropolitan. These results show that at each grade level the children (as a group) made significant improvement in each subtest. These results were confirmed at each school where there were ten or more children at one grade level. Results attained by individual schools were generally consistent with these overall results. It should be noted that first-graders were not pretested in reading (i.e. comprehension).

In addition to showing the standard score means and standard deviations (S.D.), the tables present the grade equivalent scores (G.E.) that are equivalent to the mean standard scores. This should make the data easier to interpret.

Posttest mean standard scores were also examined for their deviation from grade expectancy. This was accomplished by noting on tables of norms the standard score that is equivalent to the children's end of year grade placement. The attained mean standard score was compared to the standard score equivalent of grade placement by using a

t test. The results indicate the end-of-year status on each subtest. Significant differences above or below grade placement are noted. Where not noted, the attained posttest mean score does not differ significantly from grade placement.

These results show that first graders were relatively strong in word knowledge and word analysis, but below grade placement on the posttest of reading comprehension. Children in other grades were below grade placement in two or more subtests. However, third and sixth graders were not significantly below grade placement on posttests of language.

The general impression of the Metropolitan results is that children made significant gains in all areas; the magnitude of the average gains was substantial (from 4 to 8 months in word knowledge, 8 or 9 months in word analysis, 6 to 9 months in reading comprehension, 8 to 12 months in language, and 7 to 10 months in spelling); and the discrepancy between mean posttest performance and grade placement in any one subtest ranges from two months in second grade to 15 months in sixth grade.

TABLE 1

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Results[a]
on the Metropolitan Achievement Test
Primary I Form F for Grade 1, N=119

Test	Pretest Mean SS and S.D.	Equivalent G.E.	Posttest Mean SS and S.D.	Equivalent G.E.
Word knowl.	26.63 5.98	1.3	44.77[d] 12.19	2.0
Word anal.	29.35 5.18	1.2	42.82[c] 8.61	2.0
Reading			39.25[b] 9.62	1.7
Total reading			40.69 9.03	1.9

[a] All gains are significant at <.001 level.

[b] Significantly below SS equivalent of grade placement of 1.9 (P<.001).

[c] Significantly above SS equivalent of grade placement of 1.9 (P<.001).

[d] Significantly above SS equivalent of grade placement of 1.9 (P<.05)

TABLE 2

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Results[a]
on the Metropolitan Achievement Test
Primary II Form F for Grade 2, N=73

Test	Pretest Mean SS and S.D.	Equivalent G.E.	Posttest Mean SS and S.D.	Equivalent G.E.
Word knowl.	47.23 5.84	2.2	54.18 9.37	2.7
Word anal.	44.89 6.83	2.2	54.82 8.03	3.1
Reading	38.27 9.98	1.7	50.53[b] 11.22	2.5
Total reading	42.33 8.21	2.0	51.93[c] 10.53	2.6
Spelling	44.21 8.24	2.0	57.51 7.56	2.9

[a] All gains are significant at <.001 level.

[b] Significantly below SS equivalent of grade placement of 2.9 (P<.001)

[c] Significantly below SS equivalent of grade placement of 2.9 (P<.05)

TABLE 3

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Results[a]
on the Metropolitan Achievement Test
Elementary Form F for Grade 3, N=62

Test	Pretest Mean SS and S.D.	Equivalent G.E.	Posttest Mean SS and S.D.	Equivalent G.E.
Word knowl.	51.84 6.27	2.5	58.84[b] 5.25	3.2
Reading	47.47 8.26	2.2	55.15[b] 9.75	2.8
Total reading	48.82 6.44	2.4	56.15[b] 6.24	3.0
Language	58.19 7.54	2.8	67.19 8.51	3.6
Spelling	53.37 9.47	2.6	62.32[b] 7.88	3.4

[a] All gains are significant at <.001 level.

[b] Significantly below SS equivalent of grade placement of 3.9 (P<.001)

TABLE 4

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Results[a]
on the Metropolitan Achievement Test
Elementary Form F for Grade 4, N=82

Test	Pretest Mean SS and S.D.	Equivalent G.E.	Posttest Mean SS and S.D.	Equivalent G.E.
Word knowl.	59.72 6.01	3.3	64.34[b] 5.54	3.7
Reading	54.93 7.07	2.8	61.79[b] 9.03	3.5
Total reading	56.45 5.91	3.0	62.13[b] 6.56	3.6
Language	64.46 8.45	3.3	72.98[b] 7.70	4.5
Spelling	62.39 9.61	3.4	68.91[b] 8.71	4.3

[a] All gains are significant at <.001 level.

[b] Significantly below SS equivalent of grade placement of 4.9 (P<.001)

TABLE 5

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Results[a]

on the Metropolitan Achievement Test

Intermediate Form F for Grade 5, N=71

Test	Pretest Mean SS and S.D.	Equivalent G.E.	Posttest Mean SS and S.D.	Equivalent G.E.
Word knowl.	66.56 5.90	4.1	72.32[b] 8.15	4.8
Reading	66.48 8.40	3.9	71.73[b] 8.52	4.7
Total reading	65.97 6.95	4.1	71.99[b] 7.60	4.8
Language	73.31 6.84	4.5	79.48[b] 7.08	5.3
Spelling	72.37 6.65	4.7	77.93[c] 6.04	5.4

[a] All gains are significant at <.001 level

[b] Significantly below SS equivalent of grade placement of 5.9 (P<.001).

[c] Significantly below SS equivalent of grade placement of 5.9 (P<.01).

TABLE 6

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Results[a]
on the Metropolitan Achievement Test
Intermediate Form F for Grade 6, N=103

Test	Pretest Mean SS and S.D.	Equivalent G.E.	Posttest Mean SS and S.D.	Equivalent G.E.
Word knowl.	71.68 5.94	4.8	77.02[b] 6.36	5.6
Reading	71.33 7.33	4.5	76.82[b] 7.99	5.4
Total reading	71.47 5.68	4.6	77.28[b] 6.28	5.5
Language	80.18 6.37	5.4	85.84 7.08	6.4
Spelling	76.65 6.48	5.2	82.59[b] 6.19	6.2

[a] All gains are significant at <.001 level.

[b] Significantly below SS equivalent of grade placement of 6.9 (P<.001).

Stanford Early School Achievement Test

Kindergarten children in the Title I program were tested on two subtests of the Stanford Early School Achievement Test in January 1977. Posttests were administered in May 1977 by the school department. Only the two subtests that were administered both as pretests and as posttests could be analyzed for evidence of improvement. These two subtests, (1) Letters and Sounds, and (2) Aural Comprehension, are measures of cognitive abilities that are program objectives of the LEAP program at the kindergarten level.

Pre and posttest results (raw scores) are compared in Table 7 using the t test for correlated observations. The group of fifty-seven kindergarten children from eight schools made significant progress in both subtest areas.

TABLE 7

Progress of 57 Kindergarten Children on Stanford Early School Achievement Subtests

		Pretest Mean Raw Score and S.D.	Posttest Mean Raw Score and S.D.	t	p
Letters and sounds	Mean	13.54	18.39	7.171	<.001
	S.D.	5.23	6.65		
Aural comprehension	Mean	13.77	17.98	7.267	<.001
	S.D.	4.15	4.51		

Phonics

A test of phonics knowledge was administered to children in grades 1, 2, 3 and 4. Only posttests were administered to 119 first graders. Pretests and posttests were administered to children in grades 2, 3 and 4. The instrument comprised four subtests and yielded subtest and total test scores. The areas and the number of items in each area tested are as follows: single consonants (18), consonant blends (19), consonant digraphs (5), vowels (10), and total test (52).

As shown in Table 8 the 119 first graders showed considerable knowledge of consonant blends and vowels, and near-mastery of single consonants.

Table 9 shows comparisons of pretest and posttest results for grades 2, 3 and 4. Significant progress was made in all subtests by grades 2 and 3. Grade 4 shows significant improvement in two of the four subtests, and near-mastery in posttest results of all four subtests. The results of the phonics testing demonstrate that the children in the LEAP program substantially developed phonics knowledge.

TABLE 8

Phonics Posttest Achievement

of First-Graders (N=119)

	Test	Raw Score Mean	S.D.
1.	Single consonants	16.1	3.26
2.	Consonant blends	13.1	6.55
3.	Consonant digraphs	2.6	1.88
4.	Vowels	7.6	2.71
5.	Total	39.4	12.19

TABLE 9

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Phonics Results

Scores	Pretest Mean and S.D.	Posttest Mean and S.D.	t	p
	Grade 2, N=70			
S. cons	16.6 1.9	17.3 1.1	3.048	<.01
C. blends	13.4 5.2	17.7 2.3	7.565	<.001
C. digraphs	2.2 2.0	4.4 .9	9.054	<.001
Vowels	7.5 2.9	9.3 1.2	5.870	<.001
Total	39.8 9.1	48.7 3.8	9.225	<.001
	Grade 3, N=64			
S. cons.	17.1 1.2	17.5 .8	2.656	<.05
C. blends	17.2 2.7	18.2 1.6	2.616	<.05
C digraphs	3.8 1.5	4.5 1.0	3.838	<.001
Vowels	9.1 1.1	9.5 .9	2.569	<.05
Total	47.2 4.3	49.7 3.4	4.581	<.001
	Grade 4, N=74			
S. cons.	17.5 1.0	17.6 .6	1.445	NS
C. blends	17.4 2.0	18.3 1.0	3.996	<.001
C. digraphs	4.3 1.0	4.7 .6	4.114	<.001
Vowels	9.5 .8	9.6 .7	1.239	NS
Total	48.6 3.4	50.2 2.1	4.911	<.001

NS: not significant

Structural Analysis

A test of more sophisticated word analysis knowledge was employed with fifth and sixth graders. This was the test of structural analysis. The test yielded five scores. The test areas, and the number of items in each area, are as follows: base words (8 items), prefixes (11 items), suffixes (8 items), syllable division (22 items), total test (49 items).

Pretest and posttest results obtained by 72 fifth-graders and 105 sixth-graders are presented in Table 10. Comparison of pretests and posttests demonstrate that fifth and sixth-graders made substantial progress in each area of the test. Children in both grades showed considerable ability to recognize the prefixes and suffixes included in those two subtests at the time of posttesting. Additional instruction in syllable division would be appropriate for children from both grades at this time.

TABLE 10

Comparison of Pre- and Post Test Results in Structural Analysis

Scores	Pretest Mean and S.D.	Posttest Mean and S.D.	t	p
		Grade 5, N=72		
Base words	3.8 1.7	5.2 1.8	7.834	<.001
Prefixes	8.2 3.5	9.7 2.3	4.161	<.001
Suffixes	6.0 2.2	7.2 1.2	4.738	<.001
Syllabication	11.7 3.3	14.3 3.6	7.301	<.001
Total	29.7 7.4	36.3 6.3	10.392	<.001
		Grade 6, N=105		
Base words	4.5 2.0	5.8 1.7	6.439	<.001
Prefixes	10.0 2.0	10.4 1.4	2.176	<.05
Suffixes	6.4 1.9	7.1 1.1	3.446	<.01
Syllabication	14.0 3.1	16.0 2.8	7.215	<.001
Total	34.8 5.7	39.3 4.6	9.244	<.001

Physical Education

Children were referred to the physical education specialist from a number of sources, including classroom teachers, LEAP staff, and the school department personnel. In addition, children who participated during the previous year could be continued if need was evident. The physical education specialist received eighty nine new referrals. He performed diagnostic testing with 190 children. He provided special help in psychomotor skills to 157 children. These children received pretests and posttests on a psychomotor development checklist comprising items in six areas: (1) ball skills, (2) coordination, (3) balance, (4) body image and directionality, (5) strength, and (6) visual achievement. Body image and directionality assessment was used only with first-grade.

Comparison of pretest and posttest results are presented in Table 11. In general, gains were consistently made at each grade level.

TABLE 11

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Results

on a Psychomotor Development Checklist

Skill Area	Initial Mean and S.D.	Final Mean and S.D.	t	p
	Grade 1, N=43			
Ball skills	1.8 1.2	3.8 .6	12.565	<.001
Coordination	2.9 1.6	5.6 1.3	14.212	<.001
Balance	1.0 1.0	2.6 .6	9.347	<.001
Body image & dir.	2.0 1.0	2.7 .4	6.227	<.001
Strength	.3 .5	.9 .3	8.015	<.001
Visual Achiev.	.5 .6	1.0 .6	4.399	<.001
	Grade 2, N=27			
Ball skills	1.2 1.0	2.5 .7	9.441	<.001
Coordination	1.9 1.0	3.4 .8	8.089	<.001
Balance	1.0 .8	2.8 .5	10.902	<.001
Strength	1.2 .8	1.9 .4	4.133	<.001
Visual Achiev.	.5 .6	1.0 .5	3.118	<.01

Table 11
continued

Skill Area	Initial Mean and S.D.	Final Mean and S.D.	t	p
	Grade 3, N=27			
Ball skills	2.1 1.2	4.3 1.1	9.640	<.001
Coordination	1.4 .8	2.7 .5	7.123	<.001
Balance	.9 .7	1.9 .4	5.806	<.001
Strength	1.5 1.1	2.9 .5	6.450	<.001
Visual Achiev.	.6 .6	1.1 .6	4.841	<.001
	Grade 4, N=20			
Ball Skills	2.8 1.7	4.5 .9	4.931	<.001
Coordination	.4 .5	1.6 .5	8.718	<.001
Balance	.6 .7	1.6 .5	5.627	<.001
Strength	1.6 .9	2.9 .4	6.725	<.001
Visual Achiev.	.7 .6	1.5 .5	4.682	<.001

Table 11
continued

Skill Area	Initial Mean and S.D.	Final Mean and S.D.	t	p
	Grade 5, N=23			
Ball skills	.9 .9	2.7 .5	9.474	<.001
Coordination	.3 .5	2.0 1.0	8.781	<.001
Balance	.2 .4	.7 .5	4.491	<.001
Strength	1.6 .7	1.8 .5	2.011	NS
Visual Achiev.	.9 .6	1.4 .7	2.958	<.01
	Grade 6, N=17			
Ball skills	.8 .6	2.6 .7	16.000	<.001
Coordination	.9 .9	2.8 .5	8.899	<.001
Balance	.2 .4	.8 .4	5.416	<.001
Strength	1.4 .5	1.9 .2	4.243	<.001
Visual Achiev.	1.1 .6	1.5 .6	2.746	<.05

NS: not significant

Behavior Attitude Checklist

This is the third year in which the LEAP staff has made use of an instrument to ascertain growth in the affective domain: experiences and learnings which deal with changes in interest, attitude, values and "the development of appreciations and adequate adjustments."*

The checklist, a copy of which is on the following pages, is completed in the fall, as a pre-test, and in the spring, as a posttest. While the four categories remain the same: Self Confidence, Responsibility, Cooperation, and Interest,--the LEAP staff has worked on minor changes to make the instrument more specific and relevant. The Behavior Attitude Checklist represents a major effort by LEAP teachers to deal with aspects of the affective domain which seem to influence learning. To the extent that teachers are aware that these factors in the environment make a difference, they can take steps to promote these conditions in the classroom. Thus, matters which might otherwise be left to chance are dealt with in a systematic way.

A comparison of pre and post test tallies for each item (Table 12) indicates an overall increase in the numbers of students who exhibit such behavior. This

* Bloom, B.S., Editor: Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, David McKay Company, New York: 1956.

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

School_____ Child's Name _____

Title I - LEAP

Affective Domain
Behavior/Attitude Check List

LEAP Instructor
Recording Observation

Elizabeth N. Miles,
Director/Supervisor - Title I

_____

_____

If the child usually shows the behavior indicated in the statement when the opportunity arises mark the statement with a plus +.

If the child usually does not show the behavior at these times indicate with a minus -.

If you cannot make the judgment, indicate N.A. in the space.

We plan to conduct these observations over a period of two years; therefore, please use the two columns between the first two double lines for the pre and post observations the first year and the two columns between the second double lines for the second year.

	Date Recorded			
A. Self Confidence				
1. The child will attempt a new task voluntarily.				
2. The child will interact with adults.				
3. The child will volunteer information.				
4. The child will complete a task independently.				
5. The child will express his ideas and opinions.				
6. The child will interact with peers.				
B. Responsibility				
1. The child will attend school regularly.				
2. The child will arrive for classes on time.				
3. The child will take proper care of the materials and books assigned.				
4. The child will question material that is not understood.				

Medford Public Schools
Title I LEAP
Behavior/Attitude Check List, Affective Domain
Page 2.

Items	Date Recorded			
C. Cooperation				
1. The child shares materials.				
2. The child is willing to take turns.				
3. The child listens to peers.				
4. The child listens to teachers.				
5. The child responds to suggestions as well as commands.				
6. The child asks to assist teachers and other students.				
D. Interest				
1. The child expresses a general enthusiasm for the LEAP program.				
2. The child will be able to select materials of interest to him.				
3. The child shares his LEAP accomplishments outside the LEAP Learning Center.				
4. The child brings related information and materials to LEAP sessions.				

reflects not only growth but a willingness on the part of teachers to deal with these important aspects of learning. These increases in numbers of students is a key reflection of the effort and energy provided by LEAP staff. The few instances where numbers of students exhibiting behavior remained low (below 50% on Post test) warrant further examination; either in terms of the validity of the statement itself or the classroom conditions which affect it.

Item C-6: "The child asks to assist teachers and other students" remain low in the posttest in the Kindergarten class, though the number of students exhibiting the behavior almost doubles from pre to post test. It is possible that these youngest children do not have as many opportunities to engage in this kind of behavior and that it is a learned attitude. It seems apparent that by the end of Grade I over 70% of the children are recorded as having achieved this objective.

Two items under Interest bear a further look:

D-3: The child shares his LEAP accomplishments outside the Leap Learning Center;

D-4: The child brings related information and materials to LEAP sessions

Post test scores on item D-3 are:

K	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
25%	55%	56%	65%	53%	66%	58%

Certainly, a child's ability to share his accomplishments outside the Center requires that conditions exist for

this to occur. In addition it may, in some instances be difficult for LEAP teachers to observe this behavior. It is possible that classroom teachers, particularly in kindergarten, can be asked to add their observations as to the performance of this behavior by LEAP children.

Post test scores on item D-4 are:

K	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
13%	30%	44%	48%	48%	54%	54%

The steady increase of percentages reported in this item suggest that children can be encouraged to relate learnings in and out of LEAP classes. It seems worthwhile to stress this activity in Grades I and II on the premise that this integration of learning may have a cumulative effect on pupil growth. Again, as in item D-3, further communication between LEAP and other classroom teachers seems warranted.

By and large, the Behavior Attitude Checklist reflects an important and constructive part of the LEAP program. LEAP staff members have expended considerable energy and effort to enhance the learning environment by recognizing the importance of the affective domain in influencing cognitive learning and this is indicative of much of the thoroughness of the program.

TABLE 12

Kindergarten

		Pre		Post	
		#	%	#	%
		Self Confidence			
A	1	24	47	35	64
	2	35	64	45	82
	3	23	42	42	76
	4	13	24	29	53
	5	24	44	38	69
	6	40	73	47	85
		Responsibility			
B	1	45	82	46	84
	2	36	65	37	67
	3	30	55	37	67
	4	17	31	31	56
		Cooperation			
C	1	37	67	44	80
	2	40	73	43	78
	3	39	71	43	78
	4	39	71	42	76
	5	30	55	33	60
	6	11	20	21	38
D	1	43	78	51	93
	2	23	42	30	55
	3	10	18	14	25
	4	6	11	7	13
Total:		55			

TABLE 12
cont'd

Grade 1

		Pre		Post	
		#	%	#	%
		Self Confidence			
A	1	61	60	79	77
	2	79	77	98	96
	3	68	67	92	90
	4	45	44	67	66
	5	59	58	82	80
	6	77	75	95	93
		Responsibility			
B	1	101	99	99	97
	2	89	87	89	87
	3	85	83	91	89
	4	46	45	74	73
		Cooperation			
C	1	81	79	90	88
	2	77	75	90	88
	3	80	78	87	85
	4	81	79	91	89
	5	93	91	85	83
	6	46	45	73	72
		Interest			
D	1	82	80	95	93
	2	54	53	79	77
	3	36	35	56	55
	4	11	11	31	30

Total: 102

TABLE 12
cont'd

Grade 2

		Pre		Post	
		#	%	#	%
		Self Confidence			
A	1	44	65	59	87
	2	57	84	68	1.00
	3	50	74	63	93
	4	30	44	50	74
	5	43	63	58	85
	6	60	88	67	99
		Responsibility			
B	1	66	97	66	97
	2	48	71	53	78
	3	56	82	65	96
	4	28	41	56	82
		Cooperation			
C	1	63	93	66	97
	2	61	90	66	97
	3	54	79	62	91
	4	54	79	62	91
	5	55	81	59	87
	6	35	51	48	71
		Interest			
D	1	61	90	66	97
	2	33	49	55	81
	3	19	28	38	56
	4	16	8	30	44
Total:		68			

TABLE 12
cont'd

Grade 3

		Pre		Post	
		#	%	#	%
		Self Confidence			
A	1	42	68	52	84
	2	58	94	60	97
	3	49	79	59	95
	4	30	48	42	68
	5	46	74	56	90
	6	58	94	62	1.00
		Responsibility			
B	1	61	98	59	95
	2	61	98	50	81
	3	56	90	57	92
	4	39	63	56	90
		Cooperation			
C	1	59	95	62	1.00
	2	59	95	61	98
	3	60	97	62	1.00
	4	58	94	59	95
	5	56	90	60	97
	6	43	69	53	85
		Interest			
D	1	53	85	61	98
	2	39	63	50	81
	3	30	48	40	65
	4	16	26	30	48
Total:		62			

TABLE 12
cont'd

Grade 4

		Pre		Post	
		#	%	#	%
		Self Confidence			
A	1	45	60	57	76
	2	65	87	71	95
	3	51	68	61	81
	4	37	49	51	68
	5	45	60	60	80
	6	63	84	72	96
		Responsibility			
B	1	63	84	70	93
	2	63	84	63	84
	3	65	87	73	97
	4	35	47	58	77
		Cooperation			
C	1	67	89	74	99
	2	67	89	70	93
	3	66	88	70	93
	4	64	85	70	93
	5	60	80	67	89
	6	36	48	47	63
		Interest			
D	1	52	69	61	81
	2	49	65	63	84
	3	25	33	40	53
	4	16	21	36	48
Total:		75			

TABLE 12
cont'd

Grade 5

		Pre		Post	
		#	%	#	%
		Self Confidence			
A	1	49	70	58	83
	2	64	91	65	93
	3	57	81	60	86
	4	35	50	50	71
	5	50	71	60	86
	6	64	91	69	99
		Responsibility			
B	1	68	97	69	99
	2	66	94	69	99
	3	69	99	69	99
	4	48	69	59	84
		Cooperation			
C	1	64	91	66	94
	2	63	90	65	93
	3	66	94	62	89
	4	65	93	67	96
	5	61	87	66	94
	6	46	66	57	81
		Interest			
D	1	43	61	63	90
	2	48	69	61	87
	3	30	43	46	66
	4	23	33	38	54
Total:		70			

TABLE 12
cont'd

Grade 6

		Pre		Post	
		#	%	#	%
		Self Confidence			
A	1	64	60	97	92
	2	91	86	98	92
	3	78	74	86	81
	4	56	53	78	74
	5	68	64	81	76
	6	89	84	96	91
		Responsibility			
B	1	102	96	101	95
	2	97	92	97	92
	3	96	91	103	97
	4	67	63	73	69
		Cooperation			
C	1	97	92	99	93
	2	96	91	99	93
	3	94	89	101	95
	4	92	87	95	90
	5	84	79	95	90
	6	53	50	75	71
		Interest			
D	1	70	66	87	82
	2	58	55	82	77
	3	36	34	61	58
	4	39	37	57	54
Total:		106			

Results of Parent Questionnaire

A parent questionnaire was distributed to parents of children in the LEAP program. The results of the questionnaire are shown, by grade in Table 13. A summary of the results appears in Table 14.

Examination of the results shows that parents find the LEAP program effective and helpful. Eighty seven percent of parents feel it has helped their child's reading (Question 1) and 89% feel that LEAP help is effective (Question 4). Student perception as reported to parents is reflected in Question 3 which indicates that 90% of parents feel that their children like the help they are getting.

The improvement of attitude toward reading (Question 5) is noted by 79% of the parents. The relatively large number of "Uncertain" 14% is affected by the relevance of this question for Kindergarten children's parents. It is clear that only 4% disagree with the LEAP contribution toward attitude improvement. If results of Question 5 are examined next to results of Question 2 which reflects parental understanding of LEAP's contribution to attitude improvement reflects the difficulty of attributing causal relationships. Still, fully 70% feel that the LEAP influence has been favorable.

Question 6, whether LEAP will help in the future is answered in the affirmative by 82% of parents, with 4%

disagreeing. The 10% of parents who responded as "uncertain" include parents of sixth graders who may be responding in the light of the movement of their children to the junior high school. Question 7 is, in a sense, a vote of confidence in the LEAP program and only 4% of parents indicated they disagreed. The 12% of "uncertain" responses may reflect less a lack of confidence, but uncertainty if the child will continue to need LEAP help next year. Still, 75% of parents feel confident that the program's effects are positive and want children to continue to benefit from it.

Question 8 should be perceived in the light of last year's recommendations. It was suggested that LEAP teachers play a more informative role in helping parents assess this factor of reading more. The 69% who agreed is an increase from the 62% who agreed in 1976. By the same token only 18% were uncertain compared to last year's 21%. The disagree column remains the same: 11%. (See page 52, 1975-76 Evaluation Report)

By and large the LEAP program has the support of the parents of children in the program. Improved communication with parents and efforts to promote understanding of the impact of LEAP seem to have been worthwhile.

MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

TITLE I - LEAP

School_____ Date_____

Grade child is in this year_____

Parent Questionnaire

	agree	disagree	uncertain
1. The LEAP program has been of help to my child in his/her reading	_____	_____	_____
2. The LEAP program has contributed to improving my child's attitude toward school.	_____	_____	_____
3. My child likes the special help help he/she is getting in the LEAP program.	_____	_____	_____
4. I think the special help LEAP provides is effective.	_____	_____	_____
5. I think my child's attitude toward reading has improved because of LEAP.	_____	_____	_____
6. I think the LEAP program will help my child in school next year.	_____	_____	_____
7. I think my child should continue in the LEAP program next year.	_____	_____	_____
8. My child is reading more books for enjoyment than he/she did last year.	_____	_____	_____

Comments:_____

TABLE 13

Tally of Responses to Parent Questionnaire

Questionaire Item	Kindergarten			Grade 1		
	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain
1	6	3	6	55	2	4
2	12	2	5	47	2	12
3	15	1	4	58	1	4
4	15	1	2	58	2	5
5	5	2	8	49	2	9
6	15	1	4	54	1	6
7	14	2	4	47	2	9
8	6	4	5	42	7	11
Number of Returns	27			63		

TABLE 13
cont'd

Tally of Responses to Parent Questionnaire

	Grade 2			Grade 3		
Questionnaire Item	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain
1	43	2	4	49	0	1
2	38	2	11	29	3	15
3	46	0	4	46	0	3
4	45	0	5	46	1	2
5	39	0	11	42	2	6
6	39	0	9	43	0	4
7	37	0	11	42	1	7
8	39	2	8	37	5	8
Number of Returns	51			50		

TABLE 13
cont'd

Tally of Responses to Parent Questionnaire

	Grade 4			Grade 5		
Questionaire Item	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain
1	46	1	5	42	1	1
2	42	4	5	31	1	10
3	46	3	1	40	2	2
4	43	1	0	42	2	0
5	45	4	3	37	3	3
6	45	0	3	40	1	0
7	40	1	8	40	1	0
8	40	8	4	25	6	13
Number of Returns	52			44		

TABLE 13
cont'd

Tally of Responses to Parent Questionnaire

	Grade 6		
Questionnaire Item	Agree	Disagree	Uncertain
1	49	0	4
2	35	6	12
3	48	5	1
4	48	2	3
5	46	0	6
6	37	4	7
7	29	8	0
8	40	3	10
Number of Returns	54		

TABLE 14

Summary of Responses to Paıent Questionnaire

	Agree		Disagree		Uncertain	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
1	290	87	9	3	25	7
2	234	70	20	6	70	21
3	299	90	12	4	19	6
4	297	89	9	3	17	5
5	263	79	13	4	46	14
6	273	82	7	2	33	10
7	249	75	15	4	39	12
8	229	69	37	11	59	18

Number of Returns 334

Parent Advisory Council

While activities of the Parent Advisory Council are discussed in the Section on Administration of the Program, comments of individual P.A.C. members are included here. They reflect the effort expended by LEAP staff members to make the P.A.C. a vital and important part of the total program. These parents are most closely involved with the ongoing program and are in a position to note weaknesses as well as strengths. P.A.C.s also serve as a crucial link with the community at large and help to promote support for the program. Parent meetings, designed to help parents understand more about child growth and development, are discussed in a number of these letters and indicate the importance of these LEAP sponsored activities. A sampling of letters from P.A.C. officers follows:

As Chairperson of the Parent Advisory Council of the Title I Program LEAP, I feel that LEAP is a great benefit to the children of our program because it is an important supplement to their educational needs.

Being in this program for four years, I certainly appreciate what is being done for our children.

Sincerely,
Frances Amari
Chairperson of Title I-LEAP
Member of Massachusetts State PAC

* * *

Listening to the guest speakers provided me with valuable insights into the needs of the children covered under Title 1 both in a personal sense, inasmuch as my children attend Leap, but also in a general sense because many of the PAC meetings were educational and extremely interesting. Having the opportunity to witness first hand the innovative techniques, new teaching aids and especially the child and therapist actually at work was also very informative. The experience of utilizing at home the material from the resource room was especially rewarding because it gave me a feeling of actual participation in something that was beneficial to my child which sometimes seemed lacking in their regular classroom situation. But most important, my children enjoy attending Leap and have progressed in previously troubled areas.

Mrs. Diane O'Hare
Parent Advisory Council
Franklin School

* * *

As a member of the Parent Advisory Council for Title I, I wish to comment that the past year, 1976-1977, was another satisfying one. Everyone involved with Title I, from Mrs. Miles, the Director/Supervisor, to the instructors and parents has to feel "nothing but good" about our wonderful program.

I look forward to another progressive year and wish for more parent cooperation and participation. Every year we pick up a few interested parents and to myself and Title I --"That's Progress."

Nancy Iovanni
Parent Advisory Council

* * *

Title I has been a great inspiration to my child. Title I has given my child opportunities she would have never received throughout her education if she had not been in this program. Title I gives a child confidence and encouragement that they need throughout their school years.

I hope Title I continues not only for my child's sake but for many other children who desperately need such a program.

I look forward to an extension of Title I in other areas such as math.

Mrs. Lois Berardi
Kennedy School
Parent Advisory Council

* * *

After completing my first year as a PAC member, I have come to have the opinion that quite a few people have our children's welfare in mind.

Through the LEAP program, many children have found it easier to cope in the school room.

I have found with my own child, he has come to find out he can do better. He has improved all around and most of it has to do with the help he has received through the program.

As a PAC member, one of my wishes is that this could be expanded to more children, and more parents learn the type of help that their children receive.

Looking forward to next year!

Mrs. Diane Costello
Parent Advisory Council
St. Raphael's School

* * *

I feel that the LEAP program has helped my child in all areas, especially reading. It has given him confidence to accomplish many things in school and out. I also think that the staff of the LEAP program are great and so does he, and this makes him eager to learn and he enjoys school more.

Mrs. Lawrence Mahoney
Parent Advisory Council
Medford Public Schools

Conclusions and Recommendations

1. A high-quality instructional program was provided by the LEAP staff. This resulted in appreciable gains as measured on the Metropolitan Achievement Tests and tests of word analysis skills. The gains were of substantial magnitude in the areas of word analysis, reading, language and spelling.

2. Instructors should emphasize the development of reading comprehension in grades 3 to 6. Children in grades 5 and 6 should also be taught a range of skills in structural analysis and syllable division.

3. Kindergarten children made substantial improvement in aural comprehension and knowledge of letters and sounds. This aspect of the instructional program should be continued.

4. Identification and remediation of weaknesses in psychomotor development were accomplished successfully.

5. Continuing from last year's recommendation (#9) designed to encourage independent reading, LEAP teachers should develop ways to make parents aware of the amount of reading that is being done, both within the school and at home.

6. To help parents with concerns about the relationship of the LEAP program to the Junior High School requirements (as expressed in the results of the parent response to questions 6 and 7 on the parent questionnaire), the LEAP teachers of sixth graders should initiate activities to

promote articulation with the Junior High Schools.

7. The Director should continue to monitor the non-English speaking population so that, if there is a trend toward greater numbers, an appropriate staff development program can be instituted.

8. The behavior-attitude instrument has been continually refined by the staff. With respect to items relating to communication between the LEAP program and the classroom, perhaps the classroom teachers should respond to items D-3 and #-4.

9. The staff developed a self-evaluation checklist. This instrument should be used in 1977-1978.

10. The LEAP program should continue having a full-time Director, combining the responsibilities formerly assumed by the supervisor of instruction and the director, with no additional teaching duties. This will permit close supervision of the LEAP staff, effective parent involvement, and communication with school administrators.

11. The Director should be encouraged to continue parent workshops instituted this year.

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

TITLE I - LEAP

Self-Evaluation Checklist for Title I Staff

This is an Evaluation Checklist developed by the Title I Staff at a series of In-Service Workshops. Its primary purpose is to provide criteria by which the LEAP staff members can measure their own effectiveness. The process of developing this Self-Evaluation Checklist was helpful in defining and clarifying further evolvement of the philosophies of the LEAP program and thus should prove helpful in orientation of new Title I LEAP staff members.

I Affective Domain

Date Recorded _____

	Yes	No	Comment
1. Is the Title I Learning Center an attractive, exciting, motivating area for students?			
2. Do I make sure all pupils feel welcome in the Title I Center?			
3. Do I try to develop a positive self-image in each student through success, praise and positive motivational techniques?			
4. Do I try to seek out reasons other than academic why students might be doing poor work?			

II. Diagnosis and Evaluation

Date Recorded _____

	Yes	No	Comment
1. Did I administer and record the designated pre and post standardized tests?			
2. Did I record all skills mastered on the Behavioral Objective Checklist?			
3. Have I administered the selected Phonics Inventory and Structural Analysis Test to each child in order to determine specific areas of need?			
4. Do I keep current Specific Objective forms on each child?			

Date Recorded_____

III. Daily Planning and Preparation

	Yes	No	Comment
1. Do my lessons reflect the deficit areas indicated on the Behavioral Objective forms?			
2. Do my lessons show continuity of skill development from day to day?			
3. Does the child engage in a number of activities in a single class period according to his age, interest and instructional level?			
4. Are all the necessary materials for the lesson readily available?			
5. Do I plan for a review of skills taught?			

Date Recorded_____

IV. Teaching Techniques

	Yes	No	Comment
1. Are my teaching methods stimulating?			
2. Are my lesson plans well organized and executed?			
3. Do I make use of language experience activities to build experiental background and develop sight vocabulary?			
4. Do I make use of directed reading activities?			
5. Do I use a multi-media approach in my teaching?			
6. Do I encourage active participation in my lessons?			
7. Do I provide for ample discussion?			
8. Do I periodically try an innovative approach?			
9. Do I provide for individual differences?			

Date Recorded _____

V. Classroom Management

	Yes	No	Comment
1. Have I established routines for effective classroom management?			
2. Are my individual records thorough, up to date and well used?			
3. Do I have designated areas for materials, work folders, etc?			
4. Are children encouraged to develop independence in following a work plan?			

Date Recorded _____

VI. Communication

	Yes	No	Comment
1. Do I contribute to intrastaff communications?			
2. Do I discuss and evaluate each child with his classroom teacher?			
3. Do I make an effort to establish and maintain communication with parents?			
4. Do I make an effort to establish and maintain communication with administrators?			
5. Do I make an effort to involve community in Title I?			

Date Recorded _____

VII. Professional Growth and Development

	Yes	No	Comment
1. Have I strived for professional betterment through:			
a. Courses			
b. Workshops			
c. Journals			
d. Resource People			
e. Seminars			
2. Have I incorporated this knowledge into my daily teaching?			

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

TITLE I - LEAP

REMEDIAL READING SPECIALISTS

As Title I Remedial Reading Specialists, our first objective is to plan and implement suitable programs to satisfy the individual needs of qualified Title I students in the growth and development and practice of cognitive skills essential to reading through individualized reading programs.

Our second objective is to administer individual reading tests to Title I children whose names are referred to us by the Title I instructors as well as the classroom teacher and principal in each target school that we service.

In order to accomplish our first objective, that of planning and implementing suitable programs, we begin the year by testing each individual child for whom we are responsible. We use the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test, an informal reading inventory, and/or the Silvaroli Classtoom Reading inventory. Using the test results, we begin to remediate specific individual weaknesses. We see children three or four times a week for thirty minute sessions, in small groups as on a 1:1 basis. We are wholly responsible for the reading programs for these children. To fulfill our second objective that of individual testing, we use the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test and the Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty. We write an evaluation of each child tested. This evaluation includes test results, test behavior, strengths and weaknesses of the child, and specific recommendations for remediation. These evaluations are used in CORE Evaluation meetings and are placed in the children's LEAP folders and cumulative folders. Occasionally, on recommendation of the Title I instructor, a child is removed from the language arts group and is seen by the Remedial Reading Specialist to give additional reinforcement on a specific reading skill. This is done on a temporary basis and may last one or two weeks.

In the fall, we attended a demonstration of new materials developed by Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich. As a result of this, some of the materials were purchased for the Title I program. We attended a two day reading conference in Sturbridge, Massachusetts, sponsored by the Massachusetts Reading Association. We heard many experts in the field of reading, including Richard Boning who spoke on the "Importance of Vocabulary". At one of the workshops, "Title I Programs", we had a chance to meet with other Title I teachers and directors for an open discussion on common goals and problems. We also had an opportunity to preview new materials.

In April, the Medford LEAP staff, in conjunction with the Randolph TRAVEL staff gave a workshop for Title I directors, principals and teachers. We spoke about the importance of the role of the remedial reading specialists and displayed many teacher and pupil made materials.

We planned and implemented a parent workshop. The role of the reading specialist was discussed. The parents were then split into two groups. One group made a "blends" game and a contraction puzzle. A reference worksheet was given out so the parents could continue to reinforce reading skills at home. The other group was taught to read a code (similar to the beginning learning experiences of a first grader). The skills involved in learning to read were then related to the subtests of the Durrell Analysis.

We attended Open Houses at the target schools to meet with the parents and to show them the LEAP learning centers and the materials available. Individual parent conferences were also held to discuss pupil progress.

We had two reading in-service workshops to further our knowledge.

Dr. Kaufman spoke to us on "Developing Reading Comprehension Skills". He talked about literal comprehension vs. interpretative comprehension, santence and phrase development, and kinds of questions. The group found this workshop to be interesting and informative. Dr. Leslie Burg spoke to us on "Innovative Techniques for Improving Reading Comprehension". We found this workshop helpful in making the transition from early language experience to reading books.

Marie Melican
and
Sherrie Wolfson,
Remedial Reading Specialists

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

TITLE I - LEAP

Sherrie R. Wolfson, Remedial Reading Specialist

Statistics

Number of children referred	35
Number of children that received specialized help	30
Number of children diagnosed	20
Number of children that have showed gains	25
Number of children that should continue to receive supplementary instruction	21
Number of children dismissed (including Gr. 6)	6 plus 3 CORE'd
Number of children that have received CORE evaluations	3 COREs pending

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

TITLE I - LEAP

Marie Melican, Remedial Reading Specialist

Statistics

Number of children referred	39
Number of children that received specialized help	37
Number of children diagnosed	57
Number of children that have showed gains	35
Number of children that should continue to receive supplementary instruction	20
Number of children dismissed (including Gr. 6)	17
Number of children that have received CORE evalua.	2

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

TITLE I - LEAP

SPEECH AND LANGUAGE SPECIALISTS

Research has shown that one out of every ten people, adults and children, has a communication problem. Communication, as indicated in the Title I Language Education Acceleration Program, is the focus of the Title I program. Listening and speaking skills (important among the program's behavioral objectives) are the first two steps to successful communication and educational functioning. Deficient speech and language skills can impare one's ability to learn, whether in the form of a learning disability or overall low academic performance.

The speech pathologists are responsible for evaluating communication behavior and for devising intervention programs for those found to have special needs in speech and language. Language impairments may range from problems in phonology to deviation in grammatical structure or cognitive ability and to problems in written or gestural language.

At the beginning of the school year, the LEAP speech and language pathologists diagnose problems exhibited by children who have been identified for the program. This is accomplished through formal and informal testing procedures. Formal testing procedures include various language tests as well as tests of articulation competence. Problems may reveal themselves as difficulties in processing language at the level of phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics both in decoding and encoding tasks and affecting both the spoken and written forms of language. Children selected are scheduled for once or twice a week in coordination with the programs of other LEAP personnel.

The Speech and Language Pathologists develop individual programs of therapy. Frequent consultation to supply information and support to other LEAP staff members and classroom teachers is conducted throughout the year. When a child in the LEAP program has been referred for evaluation by the CORE Evaluation Team, the Title I Speech and Language Pathologists provide input and are often asked to participate in related conferences. In addition, periodic conferences for parent counseling and instruction are scheduled. This accompanies ongoing evaluation for determination of pupil dismissal and changes in programming. Children dismissed from formal therapy often continue on an observation basis.

In addition, the Speech Pathologists screen pre-school children for speech and language skills during kindergarten registration. At this time, conferences are arranged with parents concerned about their children's abilities. In this way, children who may have communication problems and who are entering school are more easily identified.

The Speech and Language Pathologists are also responsible for staff in-service training sessions during which demonstrations of instructional procedures and techniques for developing communication skills in the classroom are presented.

In addition, other professionals who specialize in the communication realm are invited to share new and innovative ideas with the Title I staff. The Title I Speech and Language Specialists also present a workshop to the PAC to provide speech and language information and activities which parents can use in the home setting.

Gwendolyn Black
and
Donna Paul
Speech and Language Specialists

TITLE I - LEAP

Donna Paul, Speech and Language Specialist

Statistics 1976-1977

Number of children referred	53
Number of children evaluated	61
Number of children enrolled	39
Number of children on observation	8
Number of children terminated	8
Number of children continuing therapy	31
Number of parents contacted	12

TITLE I - LEAP

Gwendolyn Black, Speech and Language Specialist

Statistics - 1976-1977

Number of children referred	48
Number of children evaluated	119
Number of children enrolled for therapy	28
Number of children on observation	12
Number of children terminating therapy	9
Number of children continuing therapy	19
Number of parents contacted	22

PHYSICAL EDUCATION SPECIALIST

As the LEAP Physical Education Specialist, I have continued to provide small group and individualized physical education experiences for identified children in the target schools. I see each child once, and where possible, twice a week for a half hour usually in a small group. The activities and skills involved in these sessions cover a broad range of physical education experiences. I work on meeting the child's particular weaknesses such as flexibility, coordination. agility, balance, and strength; and also teach them specific sports skills The LEAP physical education program has continued to serve as a supplement to the existing physical education program and aids the identified children in meeting its performance objectives.

This year, I again conducted a recreation and sports therapy type program for grades 4-6. This program was very successful in aiding the Title I children in the development and improvement of self-image.

I continued to provide information on Title I children to the CORE Evaluation Team, and assisted them in assessing the children's psycho-motor needs. I also spoke at a number of target school open houses, explaining my role in the overall LEAP team approach, and the importance of physical education in our program. I also have made myself available for numerous parent conferences.

The pre and post evaluation device that I used this year was the psychomotor development checklist that I developed last year. The checklist is made up of modified significant items from the Purdue Perceptual Motor Survey and the Medford Public Schools Physical Education Objectives list.

This year, the criterion I used for selecting children for the LEAP physical education program was referrals from classroom teachers, LEAP staff, and school department specialists.

One of the aspects that makes the LEAP program unique is that we provide the services of the physical education specialist. I feel that physical education is an integral part of the Title I program. The philosophy of LEAP is to utilize a team approach in working with the total child. We have language arts instructors and remedial reading specialists to work within the child's cognitive realm. This leaves us with the all important psycho-motor realm for the physical education specialist.

Studies have shown that children who are experiencing learning difficulties often display gross and fine motor problems as a symptom or as a cause of the learning problem. Due to repeated failures in the classroom and on the playground, LEAP children often develop very poor self-images. By working with these children in small groups, I can help them to develop the physical and social skills needed to function successfully within their peer group.

Paul Mattatall, Physical Education Specialist

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

TITLE I - LEAP

Paul Mattatall, Physical Education Specialist

Statistics 1976-1977

Number of children referred	89
Number of children diagnosed	190
Number of children receiving special help	157
Number of children dismissed	15

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

TITLE I - LEAP

Paul Mattatall, Physical Education Specialist

Number of Children per grade

I	43
II	27
III	27
IV	20
V	23
VI	17

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

TITLE I - LEAP

SCHOOL ADJUSTMENT COUNSELOR

The School Adjustment Counselor is an important member of the Title I - LEAP team. This year, many more students have been referred to me for evaluation for possible school-related problems to insure that their experience in Title I will be meaningful.

I have served as a consultant to LEAP personnel and other specialists in our program. As an Adjustment Counselor, I confer with classroom teachers, principals and other school personnel when acting on the referral of a child.

I attend weekly meetings with school guidance department personnel to maintain an involvement in their activities and participate in training sessions or specialized conferences. If necessary, I act as a referral source to community agencies for parents and children in our program when it is indicated.

In addition to consultation, evaluation and home visits to parents, I counsel children on an individual basis approximately once a week. This past school year I have conducted in-service workshops for members of our PAC as well as one for the entire LEAP staff.

In conclusion, I believe that the necessity of the adjustment counselor in our Title I program is best illustrated by the progress and measured success of the students referred when served by the competent LEAP team of specialists. Many children require individualized attention and care in solving their school or home related problems. Today, many more families have both parents employed and the number of single parent families are increasing also. This shift in the structure of the nuclear family has meant that more youngsters are left to cope with personal or family-related problems in school.

Maria Labukas, School Adjustment Counselor

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS

TITLE I - LEAP

Maria Labukas, School Adjustment Counselor

Statistics 1976-1977

Number of children referred	37
Number of children receiving Specialized Services	15
Number of children on observation (majority are kindergarten)	12
Number of children dismissed	7
Number of references to outside agencies	3

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS

TITLE I

1977

INFORMATION FOR PARENTS

As a parent of a child about to enter kindergarten, you probably have questions about what will be expected of your child and how best to prepare your child for this wonderful new experience.

Parents can help in determining their own child's needs by reading this booklet and filling out the enclosed questionnaire.

For further information, ask your school principal about Title I, LEAP - Language Education Acceleration Program or call 396-5800, Extension 310 or Extension 216.

VERBAL LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT SCALE

By Meril J. Mecham

0-1 Year level
Crows: Laughs or smiles
Produces consonant sounds reflexively
Imitates sounds
Responds to name and "no-no"
Comprehends "bye-bye" and "patacake"
Echoes words or sounds
Follows simple instructions

1-2 Year level
Expresive vocabulary of at least two words
Marks with a pencil or crayon
Recognizes names of familiar objects
Recognizes hair, mouth, ears, and hands when they are named
Expressive vocabulary of at least 25 words
Uses names of familiar objects
Identifies common pictures when they are named
Talks in short sentences
Names common pictures

2-3 Year level
Verbalizes toilet needs
Asks for "another"
Uses plurals
Speaking vocabulary of 50 words or more
Uses I, you, me in his speech
Expresses vocally a desire to take turns
Identifies action in pictures
Names one color
Names almost all common pictures

3-4 Year level
Says full name
Relates experiences
Says at least one nursery rhyme
Recites poem from memory or sings a song
Names all colors

4-5 Year level
Reads by way of pictures
Draws with pencil or crayon
Prints simple words

5-6 Year level
Relates fanciful tales
Names penny, nickel, dime
Recites numbers to thirty-
Asks meanings of words

Prepared by
Elizabeth N. Miles
Director/Supervisor
Title I - LEAP

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MEDFORD, MASSACHUSETTS
TITLE I - LEAP 1977

Objectives For Children Entering Kindergarten

LISTENING

1. The child will be able to successfully carry out simple one-step directions.
2. The child shall be able to sit and listen to a five-minute story.
3. The child will be able to identify at least three environmental sounds from the following: bell, dog barking, door closing, hammering, baby crying.

SPEAKING

1. The child will be able to label at least four common objects in simple pictures.
2. The child will be able to ask for his needs.
3. The child will demonstrate the ability to produce a four word sentence.
4. The child will be able to tell his first and last name.
5. The child will be able to communicate verbally with adults and other children.
6. The child will correctly articulate the following sounds in words, m, n,p,h,w,b,k,g,f,y,d,t.
7. The child will be able to count objects to ten.
8. The child will be able to name the colors, red, yellow, blue and green when asked the color of an object or crayon.

VISUAL SKILLS

1. The child will be able to recognize his own first name.
2. The child will be able to recognize any three numbers (1-10).
3. The child will recognize some letters of the alphabet.
4. When shown three objects or pictures the child will be able to find the two that are the same.

MOTOR SKILLS

1. The child will be able to dress himself.
2. The child will be able to manipulate crayons and pencils.
3. The child will be able to draw a simple but recognizable form, such as man or house, with a crayon or pencil.
4. The child will be able to replace toys and supplies in appropriate places.
5. The child will successfully copy the following forms: A horizontal line and vertical line.

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS

TITLE I - LEAP

Pre-kindergarten Speech and Hearing Survey 1977

School_____

Child's Name_____ Date _____

Parent's Name_____ Phone_____

Please check all the appropriate boxes below. You may make additional comments if desired on the back of this form and leave this form with the Title I representative.

	Yes	No
Child's hearing is believed to be normal.	____	____
Child's speech and language development are considered adequate for age.	____	____

Please go on and provide the following information:

Speech and Language

Child has difficulty making and using many sounds.	____	____
Child has difficulty making and using a few sounds. List examples_____	____	____
Child speaks one or two words at a time and rarely uses complete sentences. This child may have difficulty with language structures.	____	____
Child may have a voice problem - pitch, volume, rate, quality (hoarseness, harshness, nasality) If yes, has child been seen by a doctor? Treated by Doctor_____	____	____
Child is not fluent - repeats, hesitates, prolongs sounds, or grimaces during speech.	____	____
Child may need some help from the speech therapist.	____	____
I would like to speak with the speech and language therapist about my child's speech or language development.	____	____

MEDFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
TITLE I - LEAP
1977

Hearing

	Yes	No
Child has a history of ear infections Treated by Dr. _____	____	____
Child complains of frequent earaches.	____	____
Child has "draining ears" and some liquid other than wax has been noted more than once in the outer ear.	____	____
Child may have a hearing problem.	____	____
Child has a known hearing loss. Please describe	____	____

Pre-School Experience

	Yes	No
Child has attended nursery or pre-kindergarten before entering public school kindergarten. Name of school_____	____	____